

Template for Source Selection Briefing Slides for actions requiring HQ AFSPC/LGC review

- Slides should indicate classification
- Slides should indicate source selection sensitive nature of material
- Slides must be reviewed by local review committee and HQ AFSPC/LGC prior to SSAC briefing
- Slides should provide enough detail to clearly express evaluation and comparative assessment
- Notes pages option may be used for increased understanding
- Avoid use of animation, intensive graphics and other action features of powerpoint presentations (e.g. flying slides)
- This template is not mandatory

Source Selection Sensitive See FAR 3.10
4 (PLEASE NOTE: This template is NOT s ¹

References for Future Assistance

- Air Force FAR Supplement 5315.308-90(c)
 - <http://www.safaq.hq.af.mil/contracting/toolkit/part15/ProcGuide.doc>
- Air Force Source Selection Procedures Guide Chapter 4
 - <http://farsite.hill.af.mil/vfaffara.htm>
- Air Force Space Command supplement to the AFFARS

Source Selection Sensitive See FAR 3.10
4 (PLEASE NOTE: This template is NOT s ²

Title Slide

- Title of Acquisition
- Contract Reference (number)
- Date of Briefing

General

- Purpose
- Background
- Offeror's Evaluations
 - Note for Competitive Range these will be the Interim Ratings and for Decision Briefing these will be the final ratings
- Comparative Analysis (For Decision Briefing)
- Summary
- Recommendation (if this has been requested by SSA)

Source Selection Sensitive See FAR 3.10

4 (PLEASE NOTE: This template is NOT s

Purpose

- Purpose of Briefing
 - Competitive Range or
 - Decision Briefing
 - Award Without Discussions or
 - Completion of Evaluation of Final Proposal Revisions

Background

- Briefly describe effort - executive summary
 - contract type
 - major aspects of contract and anything unusual to highlight
 - funding issues/budget
 - source selection procedure followed
 - Median or Agency

Source Selection Sensitive See FAR 3.10
4 (PLEASE NOTE: This template is NOT s

Background cont'd

- Section M factors
 - Breakout of mission capability subfactors
 - Order of importance of Mission Capability subfactors
- If slides are to support award following receipt of final proposal revisions summarize number of offerors received and those removed from competitive range
 - Do not repeat evaluation of competitive range - prior briefing provided this information to SSAC and SSA
 - Very high level summary

Source Selection Sensitive See FAR 3.10
4 (PLEASE NOTE: This template is NOT s

Offeror Evaluations

- By Mission Capability Subfactor discuss color rating and risk rating assigned
 - Discuss strengths for color
 - Discuss weakness for risk
 - Clearly indicate importance of strengths and weaknesses as they impact the acquisition and what benefit they provide to government

Source Selection Sensitive See FAR 3.10
4 (PLEASE NOTE: This template is NOT s

Offeror Evaluations con't

- For the Past Performance Factor indicate rating given for overall team with slides discussing relevancy, recency and quality of past performance
 - Discuss subs and teaming partners past performance
 - relate evaluated work to the roles on instant contract
 - Discuss what key things drove overall team rating
 - Should be detailed discussion of projects
 - Discuss of how (if any) adverse past performance impact decision rating

Source Selection Sensitive See FAR 3.10
4 (PLEASE NOTE: This template is NOT s

Offeror Evaluation cont'd

- Cost/Price Factor
 - For each offeror discuss general aspects of proposal
 - Discuss audit information and how it was used
 - Discuss any Most Probable Cost Adjustments made

Source Selection Sensitive See FAR 3.10
4 (PLEASE NOTE: This template is NOT s¹⁰

Offeror Evaluations cont'd

- For each offeror discuss
 - any issues of terms and conditions
 - any other aspects of awardability
- For each offeror you may elect to do a summary chart of color, risk, past performance and price/cost following sample in AFFARS at Attachment 5315-4

Source Selection Sensitive See FAR 3.10
4 (PLEASE NOTE: This template is NOT s¹¹

Summary for Competitive Range

- For competitive range summarize rationale for exclusion of offerors from competitive range -- use matrix comparing relative interim ratings for offerors to aid in discussion
 - Matrix would include ratings for color/risk by mission capability subfactor, past performance and price/cost (see sample next slide)
 - Highlight the key distinguishing aspects of evaluation the indicate
- ***For award without discussions of award or award following final proposal revisions you will move to a comparative assessment of offerors - see following slides***

Source Selection Sensitive See FAR 3.10
4 (PLEASE NOTE: This template is NOT s¹²

Sample Comparison Matrix

to be used in Competitive Range Determination
and for Presenting Summary of Final Proposal
Revisions

Mission Capability Subfactors	ABC Inc.		XYZ Corp.		Widgets R US		
	Response to Outage	Blue Low	Green Low	Green Low	Green Low	Green Low	
	Remote Recovery	Green Low	Green Moderate	Green Low	Green Low	Green Low	
	Phase In	Green Low	Blue Low	Green Low	Green Low	Green Low	
	Enhanced Small Business	Blue Low	Green Low	Green Low	Green Low	Green Low	
	Past Performance	High Confidence		Confidence		High Confidence	
	Price	\$1.76M		\$1.25M		\$1.4M	

Source Selection Sensitive See FAR 3.10
4 (PLEASE NOTE: This template is NOT s¹³

Comparative Analysis: for Award without Discussions or After Final Proposal Revisions

- Begin with a recap of key distinctions between offerors
 - Don't repeat evaluation - focus on what really are the major aspects distinguishing that offeror
 - Discuss distinguishing aspects for factors
 - Tie impacts to benefits or risks to government
- ***Note this phase of briefing may be conducted by SSAC chair***

Source Selection Sensitive See FAR 3.10
4 (PLEASE NOTE: This template is NOT s¹⁴

Comparative Analysis: for Award without Discussions or After Final Proposal Revisions

- Weigh differences between offeror proposals
 - Compare the differences (pros and cons) of ratings that differ for mission capability, risk, past performance and cost
 - Which “best” things are really better
 - Quantify if possible the benefits or risks
 - Explain what contributed to cost differences between offerors

Source Selection Sensitive See FAR 3.10
4 (PLEASE NOTE: This template is NOT s¹⁵

Recommendation

- SSA may or may not ask for recommendation - be prepared with backup slides